



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/013,091	12/07/2001	Bahman Zargham	200302218-2	2350
22879 7590 02/25/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER NGUYEN, MERILYN P	
			ART UNIT 2163	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 02/25/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10013091	12/7/2001	ZARGHAM ET AL.	200302218-2

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

Merilyn P. Nguyen

ART UNIT	PAPER
2163	20071206

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The spelling of Steward at Pages 7 and 8 of the Examiner's Answer have been corrected as Stewart. Thanks.

WILSON LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Regarding claim 19, Stewart discloses wherein the particular information for enriching messages subscribed to by an application can be information previously published by another application (See [0226-0227]).

Regarding claim 22, Stewart discloses further discloses an inference-based rules engine that finds an appropriate business rule, regardless of the complexity of rules or the size of any rules set, the inference-based rules engine facilitating a rules service that integrates the rules and policies of the enterprise in the ODS (See page 6, paragraph [0073] and page 9, paragraphs [0117] and [0120]); and a process-flow engine that manages a flow of the business transactions, processes, and messages between the applications integrated via the ZLE framework (Work Flow Server 104, Fig. 1, and [0081] and [0139]).

Regarding claim 23, Stewart discloses providing personalized feedback and/or customized offers in real time to a customer while a customer is still engaged (See paragraph [0083]).

Regarding claim 24, Stewart discloses where the corresponding information is mined and/or analyzed in real time (See paragraph [0059]).

Regarding claim 25, Stewart discloses wherein the ZLE virtual hub includes a plurality of applications for performing information mining and/or analysis(See paragraph [0059]).

Regarding claim 26, Stewart discloses wherein the ZLE virtual hub includes a plurality of technology adapters for loosely coupling applications to and logically arranging applications around the ZLE virtual hub (See page 7, paragraph [0089] to page 8, paragraph [0113]).

Regarding claim 27, Stewart discloses wherein a plurality of applications for performing information mining and/or analysis, are loosely coupled to the ZLE virtual hub via said technology adapters (See Fig. 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (US 2002/0013759), in view of Schmidt (US 2002/0026630).

Regarding claim 4, Stewart discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in claim 1. However, Stewart is silent as to wherein the central repository provides a coherent view, in real time, of the aggregated information from across the enterprise, the process being founded on the coherent view of the aggregated information. On the other hand, Schmidt teaches an integrated view of the aggregated information from across the enterprise (See page 9, paragraph [0253], [0288], Schmidt et al.). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary